

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant submits the within amendment in response to the Official Action mailed July 22, 2003. A petition for a one-month extension of the term for response to said Official Action, to and including November 22, 2003, is transmitted herewith.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-38 that are pending in the instant application. Applicant has amended claims 7, 10, 11 21. No new matter has been added by these claim amendments.

Claims 1-6, 17-20 and 23-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *DiStefano et al.*, U.S. Patent 5,518,964. Specifically, the Examiner contends that *DiStefano* discloses "a first resilient element disposed between the first side assembly and the second side assembly (Figure 29)." (Official Action at 2.) The Examiner contends that Fig. 9 "shows a resilient component 693 being disposed between the juxtaposed assemblies prior to applying a compressive force (Column 20, Lines 38-41)." (*Id.* at 5.) *DiStefano*, however, discloses a contact-bearing surface 692 of the chip that "may be provided with a coating 693 of a polyimide or other dielectric material to protect the chip itself during the lead-forming process." (Fig. 29; col. 20, lns. 38-41.) Manifestly, the polyimide portion 693 is not described in the reference as a "resilient element," as recited in paragraph (c) of present claim 1, nor is coating 693 compressed and released to move the elements, as recited in steps (c) and (d). The present application discloses examples of this first resilient element 25 "interposed between the first side assembly 1 and the second side assembly 8" and "may comprise a plurality of individual pads 26, as depicted in FIG. 1." This resilient element "may comprise a spring or foam pad." (Figs. 1-7; application 11 0052-0053.) A compressive force is applied to the assembly

to compress at least the first resilient element 25, and the compressive force "should be sufficient to compress the resilient elements such that, upon removal of the compressive force, the resiliency in the resilient elements will move the first ends 20 of the leads 18 away from the first surface 10 of the second side assembly 8." (Fig. 7; *id.* ¶ 0062-0063.) As such, applicant submits that the rejection should be withdrawn as to claim 1.

The rejection should also be withdrawn as to claims 2-6, 17-20 and 23-38, inasmuch as each of these claims depends, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Claims 7-16, 21 and 22 were not rejected, but instead were objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner has stated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, applicant has amended claims 7, 10, 11 and 21 to place them in independent form and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, applicant submits that the objection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and objection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 21, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Steven A. Garner  
Steven A. Garner

Registration No.: 52,475  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

463469\_1.DOC